

Remarks

This communication is considered fully responsive to the non-final Office Action mailed April 11, 2007. Claims 1-28 were examined. Claims 1-28 stand rejected. Claims 1, 2, 13, and 21 are amended. No claims are canceled. No new claims are added. Reexamination and reconsideration of the currently pending claims are respectfully requested.

Interview Summary

Applicant appreciates the telephone interview Examiner Lin accorded Applicant's attorney, Mark Trenner (hereinafter, "Mr. Trenner") on August 2, 2007. During the telephone interview, Mr. Trenner expressed appreciation for the Examiner's guidance in the Office Action on page 14, paragraph 31, which states "Applicant is suggested to further amend to define how the active information model improves over time." The purpose of the interview was to help ensure Applicant's amendment is consistent with the Examiner's expectations for such an amendment.

Specifically, Mr. Trenner explained that Applicant's invention improves over time by being adaptable to changing business policies/models of the user(s) and/or enterprise(s) as described in more detail, e.g., in the published patent application at paragraphs [0005] and [0124]. See also, paragraphs [0052]-[0054]. Mr. Trenner also proposed claim amendments to claim 1 as recited herein to further clarify these distinctions. Similar amendments are now also made to claims 2, 13 and 21.

The Examiner said that clarifying amendments in this regard would likely overcome the current rejections but that he would need to update his search when Applicant files a formal Response. The Examiner also suggested Applicant amend claim 1 to note that the active information model is stored in an information system to avoid potential Section 101 issues.

Claim Rejections

Applicant appreciates the Examiner noting the typographical errors in previously submitted claim 1 (Section 112 Rejections). Applicant believes that all other claim rejections in the Office Action are now moot in view of the amendments and for the reasons discussed with Examiner Lin during the telephone interview summarized above.

These amendments are made to expedite a Notice of Allowance and are not an admission as to the propriety of the Examiner's rejections. Applicant reserves the right to present further argument if any rejections are maintained in a subsequent Office Action and to present the original claims in a later continuation application without anything herein being deemed an admission. Applicant hereby incorporates by reference all of the arguments previously presented and maintains that the claim recitations are not anticipated or rendered obvious by the cited references for at least these reasons.

Conclusion

The Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this matter. If there are any matters that may be clarified by telephone, the Examiner is encouraged to call Applicant's attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully Submitted,

Mark D. Trenner

Dated: August 9, 2007

By: _____

Mark D. Trenner
Reg. No. 43,961
(720) 221-3708